arXiv:1610.10005v3 [math.MG] 10 Dec 2016

Metric spaces and SDG

Anders Kock

Introduction

The first use of the term "Synthetic differential geometry" seems to be in Busemann's [3], [4] (1969 and 1970), so it is prior to the use of the term in, say, [6], where the reasoning goes in a different direction. In Busemann's work, the basic structure is that of *metric space*. This notion has not been much considered in the context of SDG[1] (except in its infinitesimal form: *Riemannian* metric). One reason for this is: to provide the number line R with the standard metric, one needs the absolute value function $R \to R$, given by $x \mapsto |x|$. This map, however, is not smooth at 0; and in SDG, only smooth maps can be considered.

However, the geometric reasoning of Busemann has a genuine synthetic character. It does admit co-existence with SDG, which I hope that the present note will illustrate.

1 Metric spaces and the neighbour relation

To have a metric on a set M, one needs a number line R to receive the values of the metric, usually the ring of real numbers.

[1] We shall use the acronym "SDG" when referring to the school originating with Lawvere's "Categorical Dynamics" talk (1967) and the KL Axiom ("Kock-Lawvere"), see [6], [13], [10], [8], ...

Recall that it is essential for SDG that the number line R, with its ring structure, has a rich supply of nilpotent elements, in particular, elements ϵ with $\epsilon^2 = 0$. Such nilpotent elements lead to the geometric notion of when two points in a manifold are (first order) *neighbours*, written $x \sim y$. When the manifold itself is the number line R, then $x \sim y$ will mean $(x - y)^2 = 0$.

How do such nilpotent elements coexist with the metric?

We shall study this only for the special case where the metric space M is just a Euclidean space, built on basis of the given number line R. In particular we study "lines" (or rays or geodesics) in M. We do it axiomatically, meaning that, except for addition, we are not using algebraic properties of R, except when we show how the notions and axiomatics that we give have interpretations based on the standard SDG axiomatics.

1.1 A basic picture

"*The shortest path between two points is the straight line.*"

This may be seen as a way of describing the concept of "straight line" in terms of the more primitive concept of *distance* (which may be measured by "how long time does it take to go from the one point to the other" – like "optical distance" in geometrical optics, cf. e.g. [1]).

Consider an obtuse triangle, with height ϵ at the obtuse angle (cf. figure below). In coordinates, with b as origo $(0, 0)$, the vertices are $a = (-r, 0)$, $b' = (0, \epsilon)$, and $c = (s, 0)$. The height divides the triangle in two right triangles: the one triangle has catheti of lengths r and ϵ, and the other one has catheti of lengths ϵ and s. If $\epsilon^2 = 0$, the length of the hypotenuse of first triangle is then by Pythagoras, $\sqrt{r^2 + \epsilon^2} = \sqrt{r^2} = r$, and the length of the hypotenuse of the other triangle is similarly s.

So the path from a to c via b' has length $r + s$, just as the straight line from a to c.

What distinguishes, then, in terms of length, the straight line from the path via b'? Both have length $r + s$, the minimal possible length.



The answer is not in terms of extremals, but in terms of *stationary* or *critical* values ; the length of the path via b is stationary for "infinitesimal variations" (e.g. via b'), unlike the path via b', in the sense that we shall make precise by the notion of *focus*: b is the focus of the set of points b' with distance r to a and distance s to c.

1.2 Metric spaces

In SDG, the number line R cannot be assumed to be a field, but only a local ring. To discuss metric spaces in this context, we assume that R is equipped with a strict total order $<$, compatible with the ring structure; also we assume that if $x \in R$ is invertible, then we have the "dichotomy": either $x < 0$, or $x > 0$; and vice versa if $x > 0$ or $x < 0$, then x is invertible.

To construct models, say R^n, as models of the present axiomatics, we have to assume some further algebraic properties: positive numbers have square roots; invertible square sums $\sum x_i^2$ are positive; see Subsection 1.4. In a local ring like R, "$x \neq 0$" is a weaker statement than "x is invertible", which for R, we denote "$x\#0$", or "x is *apart* from 0" or *distinct from* 0. Also, in the intended application (for R^n, say), apartness $\#$ ultimately refers to something derived from invertibility, see Subsection 1.4.

A *metric space* is a set M equipped with an apartness relation $\#$, assumed symmetric, and a symmetric function $\mathrm{dist} : M \times_\# M \to R_{>0}$, i.e. $\mathrm{dist}(a, b) = \mathrm{dist}(b, a)$ for all a, b in M with a and b apart (here, $M \times_\# M$ denotes the set of $(a, b) \in M \times M$ with $a\#b$). Since $\mathrm{dist}(a, b)$ will appear in quite a few formulae, we use Busemann's short notation:

$$\mathrm{dist}(a, b) \quad \text{is denoted} \quad ab.$$

The triangle inequality, $ac \leq ab+bc$ will play no role in the present note, except when it happens to be an equality, $ac = ab + bc$ (which

is a property that the triple of points a, b, c may or may not have). In fact, we will not be using the relation $\leq$ in the present note.

We follow Busemann in writing (abc) for the statement that the triangle equality holds for three points a, b, c (mutually apart):

$$(abc) \quad \text{means} \quad ab + bc = ac.$$

Classically, (abc) is expressed verbally: "the points a, b, c are collinear". But (abc) will be weaker than collinearity, in our context: for, $(ab'c)$ holds in the basic picture above, but a, b' c are not collinear. We shall below give a stronger notion $[abc]$ of collinearity.

The sphere $S(a, r)$ with center a and radius $r > 0$ is defined by

$$S(a, r) := \{b \in M \mid ab = r\}.$$

1.3 The neighbour relation $\sim$

Some uses of the (first order) neighbour relation $\sim$ were described in [6] §I.7, and the neighbour relation is the basic notion in [8]. Knowledge of these or related SDG texts is not needed in the following, except for Subsections 1.4, where we construct models of the present axiomatics.

Objects M equipped with a reflexive symmetric relation $\sim$, we call *manifolds*, for the present note.

The motivating examples are the n-dimensional coordinate vector spaces R^n over R, where $\underline{x} \sim \underline{y}$ means $(y_i - x_i) \cdot (y_j - x_j) = 0$ for all $i, j = 1, \ldots, n$ (where $\underline{x} = (x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ and similarly for $\underline{y}$). We refer the reader to the SDG literature (notably [8]) for an exploitation of the notion for more general manifolds. The main aspect is that any (smooth) map preserves $\sim$. Note that in particular $x \sim 0$ in R iff $x^2 = 0$.

If M is furthermore equipped with a metric, as described in the previous Section, there is a compatibility requirement, namely $x\#y$ and $y \sim y'$ implies $x\#y'$; and there is an incompatibility requirement: $x\#y$ and $x \sim y$ are incompatible, i.e. $\neg((x\#y) \wedge (x \sim y))$.

It is useful to make explicit the way the metric and the neighbour relation "interact", in the case of the number line R itself,

where we take the distance xy to mean $|y - x|$ (for $x\#y$) and take $x \sim y$ to mean $(y - x)^2 = 0$. Note that the numerical-value function used here is smooth on the set points apart from 0. For R^n and other manifolds as a model, in the context of SDG, see Subsection 1.4 below.

Neighbours of 0 in R are in SDG called first order *infinitesimals*. They have no influence on the order of R; it is a standard calculation that

Proposition 1.1 *If $x < y$, and $\epsilon \sim 0$, then $x + \epsilon < y$.*

Note that if we define $x \leq y$ to mean that "x is not $> y$", then, for $\epsilon \sim 0$,we have that ϵ is not > 0, and similarly ϵ is not < 0. So $\epsilon \leq 0$, and also $\epsilon \geq 0$. So the relation $\leq$ is only a preorder, not a partial order (unless $\epsilon^2 = 0$ implies $\epsilon = 0$), and so $\leq$ cannot be used to determine elements in R uniquely.

An example of the relation $\sim$ on a manifold is equality: $x \sim y$ iff $x = y$. If this is the case, we say that $\sim$ is *trivial* or that M is *discrete*. So the theory we are to develop for manifolds with metric have as a special case (a fragment of) Busemann's theory. The reason for introducing the $\sim$ relation is that it allows one to express, in geometric terms and without explicit differential calculus, the notion of a *stationary* (or *critical*) value of a function defined on M. (This notion is of course related to the notion of *extremal* value of a function; for the present purposes, extremal value is not so relevant as stationary value.)

We recall some notions derived from a neighbour relation $\sim$ on M (cf. [6] I.6 and [7]).

For $z \in M$, we denote by $\mathfrak{M}(z)$ the set of $z' \in M$ with $z' \sim z$, and we call it the (first order) "monad" around z.

Definition 1.2 *Let A and B are subsets of M, and $z \in A \cap B$. We say that A* touches *B at z, (or that A and B have* at least first order contact *at z) if*

$$\mathfrak{M}(z) \cap A = \mathfrak{M}(z) \cap B.$$

Equivalently: for all $z' \sim z$ in M, we have $z' \in A$ iff $z' \in B$. "Touching at z" is clearly an equivalence relation on the set of subsets of M that contain z.

Note that if A touches B in z, we have $\mathfrak{M}(z) \cap A \subseteq A \cap B$ and $\mathfrak{M}(z) \cap B \subseteq A \cap B$.

There is a refined notion of touching:

Definition 1.3 *Let A and B be subsets of M. We say that they touch* cleanly *at $z \in A \cap B$ if*

$$A \cap B = \mathfrak{M}(z) \cap A = \mathfrak{M}(z) \cap B \tag{1}$$

In the intended application, if A and B have higher order contact at a point z, then they touch each other, but not cleanly.

Definition 1.4 *A subset $N \subseteq M$ will be called* focused *if there is a unique $n \in N$ so that $n' \sim n$ for all $n' \in N$. This unique n may be called the* focus *of N.*

Clearly, any singleton set is focused. If $\sim$ is trivial (or more generally, if $\sim$ is transitive), then singleton subsets are the only focused subsets.

Note that N being focused is a property of N, and the focus of N is not an added structure.

"Touching" in general only makes sense in the context where the point z of touching is specified; but for clean touching, one does not need to specify the point z; it is the focus of $A \cap B$.

In the intended application in SDG, we have, for spheres in R^n, the following facts, which we here take as an axioms, primarily to simplify the terminology:

Axiom 1.5 *Given spheres A and B in M, and given $b \in A \cap B$. Then:*

$$\mathfrak{M}(b) \cap A \subseteq \mathfrak{M}(b) \cap B \quad \textit{implies} \quad \mathfrak{M}(b) \cap A = \mathfrak{M}(b) \cap B.$$

This is essentially because the spheres have the same dimension.

Axiom 1.6 *For spheres A and B in M (whose centers are apart), we have that if A and B touch in a point $b \in A \cap B$, then they touch cleanly in this point, i.e.*

$$\mathfrak{M}(b) \cap A = \mathfrak{M}(b) \cap B = A \cap B;$$

and furthermore, this set has focus b.

The validity of this Axiom in the intended model for the axiomatics is argued in Subsection 1.5 below.

1.4 Models based on SDG

We consider in the present Subsection models for dist, $\#$ and $<$, which are built from a (commutative) local ring R with a strict total order $<$, as above. So the set of invertible elements in R fall in two disjoint classes $R_{>0}$ and $R_{<0}$, both stable under addition, and with $R_{>0}$ stable under multiplication and containing 1. We have $x < y$ if $(y - x) \in R_{>0}$, and $x > y$ if $(y - x) \in R_{<}$. For $x - y$ invertible, one has the dichotomy: $x < y$ or $x > y$. We write $x \# y$ for $y - x$ invertible. The *absolute value* function is the function $R_{<0} \cup R_{>0} \to R_{>0}$ given by $x \mapsto -x$ if $x < 0$ and $x \mapsto x$ if $x > 0$

We ask, in the present Subsection, that positive square roots of elements in $R_{>0}$ exist uniquely.

If $\underline{x} = (x_1, \ldots, x_n) \in R^n$ has at least one of the x_is invertible, we say that $\underline{x}$ is a *proper* vector. For a proper vector $\underline{x}$, we ask, in the present Subsection, that $\sum x_i^2$ is > 0, so $\sqrt{\sum x_i^2} \in R_{>0}$ exists. So for a proper vector $\underline{x}$ we may define $|\underline{x}| := \sqrt{\sum x_i^2}$.

We say that vectors $\underline{x}$ and $\underline{y}$ in R^n are *apart* (written $\underline{x} \# \underline{y}$) if $\underline{y} - \underline{x}$ is a proper vector; then $|\underline{y} - \underline{x}| \in R_{>0}$ gives rise to a metric $\mathrm{dist}(\underline{x}, \underline{y})$, the *distance* between $\underline{x}$ and $\underline{y}$.

We take for $\sim$ on R^n the standard one from SDG, namely

$$(x_1, \ldots x_n) \sim (y_1, \ldots, y_n) \text{ if } (x_i - y_i) \cdot (x_j - y_j) = 0 \text{ for all } i, j = 1, \ldots n.$$

We write $\underline{x}$ for $(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$, and similarly for other points in R^n.

The following depends on some of the basic axiomatics of SDG.

Proposition 1.7 *For any $\underline{x} \in R^n$, the monad $\mathfrak{M}(\underline{x})$ is focused, with $\underline{x}$ as focus.*

Proof. For simplicity of notation, we prove that the monad $\mathfrak{M}(\underline{0})$ is focused. The traditional notation in SDG for this monad is $D(n)$, and it may be described as $\{\underline{d} = (d_1, \ldots, d_n) \mid d_i \cdot d_j = 0\}$ for all i, j. For $D(1)$, one writes just D; so $d \in D$ means $d^2 = 0$. So assume that $\underline{x} = (x_1, \ldots, x_n) \in D(n)$ has $\underline{x} \sim \underline{d}$ for all $\underline{d} \in D(n)$. This means that for all i, j,

$$0 = (x_i - d_i) \cdot (x_j - d_j) = -x_i \cdot d_j - x_j \cdot d_i,$$

using $x_i \cdot x_j = 0$ and $d_i \cdot d_j = 0$. Take in particular $\underline{d}$ of the form $(d, 0, \ldots, 0)$, with $d \in D$ and take $i = j = 1$. Then the equation gives for all $d \in D$ that $0 = -2x_1 \cdot d$, so for all $d \in D$, we have $x_1 \cdot d = 0$. By cancelling the universally quantified d, we get $x_1 = 0$, by the basic axiom for SDG, see [6] I.1. Similarly, we get $x_2 = 0$ etc., so $\underline{x} = \underline{0}$.

More generally, one may prove that for suitable non-degenerate subspaces $H \subseteq R^n$, the set $\mathfrak{M}(z) \cap H$ is focused (for $z \in H$). This applies e.g. to a hyperplane H (zero set of a proper affine map $R^n \to R$).

Under the axiomatics of SDG, it can be proved that all constructed maps $R^n \to R^m$ (even locally defined such maps) preserve $\sim$. From this follows that for n-dimensional manifolds (meaning manifolds M modelled locally on R^n), every monad $\mathfrak{M}(x)$ in M is focused.

A subset N of a monad $\mathfrak{M}(x)$, with $x \in N$, need not be focused. Consider for example some ϵ with $\epsilon^2 = 0$, and consider the set $\{\epsilon \cdot \underline{x} \mid \underline{x} \in R^n\}$. It is a subset of $\mathfrak{M}(\underline{0}) = D(n)$ and contains $\underline{0}$. But it is not focused: *any* pair of elements $\epsilon \cdot \underline{x}$ and $\epsilon \cdot \underline{y}$ in it are neighbours. In "geometry based on the ring of dual numbers" $\mathbb{R}[\epsilon]$ (as in Hjelmslev's [5]), one may define a $\sim$-relation, based on elements d of square 0, but the resulting monads will not be focused, essentially by the above argument. For, in [5], there is a fixed $\epsilon \in R$ such that every element $d \in R$ with $d^2 = 0$ is of the form $\epsilon \cdot x$.

1.5 Touching of spheres in R^n is clean touching

For simplicity of notation, we deal with the case $n = 2$, so the spheres are circles.

Proposition 1.8 *The circle S with center $(0, 1)$ and radius 1 touches the x-axis cleanly (in $(0, 0)$).*

Proof. The monad $\mathfrak{M}(0, 0)$ is $D(2) = \{(d_1, d_2) \mid d_1^2 = d_2^2 = d_1 d_2 = 0\}$. We prove that $D(2) \cap X = D(2) \cap S = X \cap S$ by proving that each of these three sets equals $D \times \{0\}$ (which is a focused set). It is obvious that $D(2) \cap X = D \times \{0\}$. Next, let $(d_1, d_2) \in D(2) \cap S$. To say that this is in S is to say $d_1^2 + (d_2 - 1)^2 = 1$, and since $d_1^2 = 0$ and $d_2^2 = 0$, this says $-2d_2 = 0$, whence $d_2 = 0$, so $D(2) \cap S \subseteq D \times \{0\}$. The converse inclusion is clear. Finally, let $(x, y) \in S \cap X$, so $y = 0$, and $x^2 + 1 = 1$, whence $x^2 = 0$, so $x \in D$, proving $S \cap X \subseteq D \times \{0\}$. The converse inclusion is clear.

By a suitable change of coordinates, we get from this:

Proposition 1.9 *In R^2, we have that if a circle touches a line in a point, then it touches it cleanly in this point.*

The following is a well known fact from elementary Euclidean geometry: "the common chord of two circles is perpendicular to the line connecting the centers". The algebraic proof of this fact in R^2 does not depend on x and y being apart; perpendicularity is expressed in terms of the standard inner product $\langle\ ,\ \rangle$ in R^2:

Proposition 1.10 *If A and B are circles with centres a and b, respectively (with $a \# b$), then if x and y are in $A \cap B$, $\langle x - y, a - b\rangle = 0$*

Proof. Let r and s be the radii of the two circles. Then we have $\langle (x - a), (x - a)\rangle = r^2$ and $\langle (x - b), (x - b)\rangle = s^2$, and similarly for y. Then $\langle x - y, a - b\rangle = 0$ follows by simple arithmetic.

Proposition 1.11 *If two circles (whose centers are apart) touch each other in a point, they touch each other cleanly in this point.*

Proof. Let the the circles be A and B, as above, and let z be the assumed touching point of A and B. By Proposition 1.10, we have $\mathfrak{M}(z) \cap A \cap B \subseteq \mathfrak{M}(z) \cap H$ where H is the hyperplane (line) through z perpendicular to $a - b$. The converse inclusion $\mathfrak{M}(z) \cap H \subseteq \mathfrak{M}(z) \cap A$ follows by Pythagoras. So A and H touch each other in z, and hence, by the Proposition 1.9, they touch each other cleanly in z, so $A \cap H = \mathfrak{M}(z) \cap A = \mathfrak{M}(z) \cap H$. By Proposition 1.10 we have the inclusion $A \cap B \subseteq A \cap H = \mathfrak{M}(z) \cap A$. On the other hand, $\mathfrak{M}(z) \cap A \subseteq A \cap B$ since A and B touch in z. So $A \cap B = \mathfrak{M}(z) \cap A$; similarly $A \cap B = \mathfrak{M}(z) \cap B$.

Finally, the set $A \cap B$ is focused; for, it equals $\mathfrak{M}(z) \cap H$ and H is a hyperplane.

2 Extrapolation

The possibility of extrapolation is a basic axiom in Busemann's synthetic geometry (Axiom D in [2], Section II). Geometrically, it says that any line segment from a point a to another point b may be extrapolated (prolonged) beyond b by the amount, of s units, say, for certain $s \in R_{>0}$. The theory we present makes a more rude statement about extrapolation, namely that extrapolation for *any* positive amount s is possible, and this implies that the spaces we consider are unbounded. (Busemann was also interested in bounded models for his axiomatics, namely e.g. elliptic spaces.)

In our context, extrapolation (and interpolation) will be achieved by the two-sphere Axioms, to be stated below. It has two parts, an external touching and an internal touching part. We formulate the two parts as two separate Axioms below, Axioms 2.2 and 2.1, respectively. In classical terms, external touching says that *two spheres touch iff the sum of their radii equals the distance between the centers*. The validity (of both parts) is well known in classical Euclidean geometry, in which case "touching" is a *differential* geometric concept; touching is not in general the same as "having precisely one point in common", although it is (classically!) so for spheres. In our context, the differential calculus is replaced by the neighbour-structure $\sim$.

The case of internal touching is illustrated in the picture below. In this case, the radii are therefore apart, let s be the smaller, and $r+s$ the larger radius; the difference is thus r, i.e. the smaller sphere is of the form $B = S(b,s)$, the larger sphere is the form $A = S(a, r+s)$, and $ab = r$ (so b is *inside* the sphere A). The focus asserted by the Axiom is denoted c in the picture (later on, we denote it $a \triangleright_s b$).

2.1 Extrapolation by internal touching

The explicit form of the two-sphere Axiom, for the case of internal touching, is (for any $r, s \in R_{>0}$ and $a\#b$ in M):

Axiom 2.1 . *Let $A = S(a, r+s)$ and $B = S(b,s)$ with $ab < r+s$. Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

1) A and B touch each other

2) $ab = r$.

The focus of $A \cap B$ implied by 1) and Axiom 1.6 is denoted c in the picture.



"$c = a \triangleright_s b$"

The focus point c deserves a notation; we write $a \triangleright_s b$ for c. We say that $a \triangleright_s b$ is obtained by *extrapolating* by the amount s from a via b, (heuristically, "going s units out from b in the direction determined by the "vector" from a to b"; so the Axiom implies that (taking s large) that there are points of arbitrary long distance to a.)

We note that we have constructed a map $b \mapsto a \triangleright_s b$ from $S(a,r)$ to $S(a, r+s)$, (one should think of it as radial projection); as any map that can be constructed, it preserves $\sim$: if $b_1 \sim b_2$ in $S(a,r)$, then $a \triangleright_s b_1 \sim a \triangleright_s b_2$.

Since $\mathfrak{M}(c) \cap A \subseteq B$, we have for all $c' \sim c$ that

$$ac' = r+s \quad \text{implies} \quad bc' = s. \tag{2}$$

And since $\mathfrak{M}(c) \cap B \subseteq A$, we have for all $c' \sim c$ that

$$bc' = s \quad \text{implies} \quad ac' = r + s, \tag{3}$$

and each of these properties charaterizes c, by c being the focus of $A \cap B = \mathfrak{M}(c) \cap A = \mathfrak{M}(c) \cap B$.

2.2 Interpolation by external touching

The internal touching of spheres as described in the Axiom was the clue to define extrapolation $a \triangleright_s b$. Similarly, external touching describes an interpolation process $a \triangleleft_s c$. Note that the sphere A here is not the same as the sphere A in Axiom 2.1:

Axiom 2.2 *Let $A = S(a, r)$ and let $C = S(c, s)$ with $ac > r$. Then the three conditions are equivalent:*
1) A and C touch each other
2) $ac = r + s$.

We have the following picture:



"$b = a \triangleleft_s c$"

The focus of $A \cap C$ implied by 1) and Axiom 1.6 is denoted b in the picture. We note that we have constructed a map $c \mapsto a \triangleleft_s c$ from $S(a, r+s)$ to $S(a, r)$, and that $b = a \triangleleft_s c$ can be characterized, in a way similar to the one at the end of Subsection, 2.1: for all $b' \sim b$, we have

$$ab' = r \quad \text{implies} \quad b'c = s \tag{4}$$

and also by

$$b'c = s \quad \text{implies} \quad ab' = r. \tag{5}$$

3 Collinearity

The following Lemma is a main tool.

Lemma 3.1 *Let a, b, c be given with $ab = r$, $bc = s$ and $ac = r+s$. Then the following six assertions are equivalent*

1a: for all $a' \sim a$ we have $a'b = r$ implies $a'c = r + s$
1b: for all $a' \sim a$ we have $a'c = r + s$ implies $a'b = r$

2a for all $b' \sim b$ we have $ab' = r$ implies $b'c = s$
2b: for all $b' \sim b$ we have $b'c = s$ implies $ab' = r$.

3a: for all $c' \sim c$ we have $bc' = s$ implies $ac' = r + s$
3b: for all $c' \sim c$ we have $ac' = r + s$ implies $bc' = s$.

Note that 3a expresses that $c = a \triangleright_s b$ by (3), and that 3b similarly expresses the same, by (2). Similarly 2a and 2b each express that $b = a \triangleleft_s c$. (We shall not use 1a or 1b, they are included for reasons of symmetry; they express that $a = c \triangleright_r b$.)

We use 2a to prove 3b. Given $c' \sim c$ with $ac' = r+s$. Let b' be $a \triangleleft_s c'$. Then $b' \sim b$, since $a\triangleleft_s$ preserves $\sim$; furthermore, b' is characterized by

2a': for all $b'' \sim b'$ we have $ab'' = r$ implies $b''c' = s$.
Then since $b \sim b'$, we may use 2a' with $b'' = b$ to conclude $bc' = s$.

Similarly, we use 3b to prove 2a: Given $b' \sim b$ with $ab' = r$. Let c' be $a \triangleright_s b'$. Then since $a\triangleright_s$ preserves $\sim$, we get $c' \sim c$. Then c' satisfies by construction

3b': for all $c'' \sim c'$ we have $ac'' = r + s$ implies $b'c'' = s$.
Then since $c \sim c'$ and $ac = r + s$ we use 3a' to conclude $b'c = s$.

We state the relevant notion of collinearity of three points a, b, c; in case $\sim$ is trivial, it is identical to the classical (abc) description $ab + bc = ac$, otherwise it is stronger, and we denote it $[abc]$:

Definition 3.2 *Given three points a, b, and c, mutually apart. Then we say that a, b, c are* collinear (with b in between a and c)*, and we write $[abc]$, if (abc), and one, hence all, of the six conditions of the Lemma 3.1 hold, where r denotes ab and s denotes bc.*

Note that for $bc = s$, the assertion $[abc]$ is equivalent to $b = a \triangleleft_s c$, and also to $c = a \triangleright_s b$, where $s = bc$. Thus

Proposition 3.3 *Given a, b, and s. Then point $c = a \triangleright_s b$ is characterized by $bc = s$ and the collinearity condition $[abc]$. Also, given a, c, and s with $s < ac$; then the point $b = a \triangleleft_s c$ is characterized by the same two conditions. In particular, $b = a \triangleleft_s (a \triangleright_s b)$, and, for $s < ac$, $c = a \triangleright_s (a \triangleleft_s c)$.*

Remark. Geometrically, the last assertion in the Proposition just describes the bijection between the two concentric circles $S(a, r)$ and $S(a, r + s)$ which one obtains by radial projection from their common center a. Note that $a \triangleright_s b$ is characterized as the touching point of two spheres; similarly for $a \triangleleft_s c$.

Sometimes, we shall write $[abc]_1$ to mean that $[abc]$ holds by virtue of 1a or 1b, and $[abc]_2$ if it holds by virtue of 2a or 2b, and $[abc]_3$ if it holds by virtue of 3a or 3b, respectively. We clearly have

$$[abc]_1 \quad \text{iff} \quad S(b, ab) \text{ touches } S(c, ac) \text{ in } a, \tag{6}$$

$$[abc]_2 \quad \text{iff} \quad S(a, ab) \text{ touches } S(c, bc) \text{ in } b, \tag{7}$$

$$[abc]_3 \quad \text{iff} \quad S(a, ac) \text{ touches } S(b, bc) \text{ in } c. \tag{8}$$

Collinearity is "associative", in the following sense. Given a list of four points a, b, c, d, mutually apart. Consider the following four collinearity assertions: $[abc], [abd], [acd], [bcd]$.

Proposition 3.4 *If two of these collinearity assertions hold, then they all four do.*

Proof. The proofs of the various cases are similar, so we give just one of them: we prove that $[abc]$ and $[acd]$ imply $[bcd]$. The point c occurs in all three of these assertions, and we concentrate on that point: we use $[abc]_3$ and $[acd]_2$ to prove $[bcd]_2$. So assume that $c' \sim c$ with $bc' = bc$. By $[abc]_3$, we therefore have $ac' = ac$. By $[acd]_2$ we therefore have the desired $c'd = cd$. This proves $[bcd]_2$.

Proposition 3.5 *Assume that $[a'ab]$. Then $a' \triangleright_s b = a \triangleright_s b$.*

Proof. $a' \triangleright_s b$ is aligned with a and b - this follows from $[a'ab]$ and associativity of collinearity (Proposition 3.4); and it has distance s to b. These two properties characterize $a \triangleright_s b$.

Remark. Note that since $ab = ba$ etc., the assertion $[cba]_1$ is the same as $[abc]_3$. From this we conclude that collinearity is symmetric: $[abc]$ iff $[cba]$. We say that three points a, b, and c are *aligned* if some permutation of them are collinear (so for the term "alignment", we ignore which point is in the middle).

The characterization of $a \triangleright_s b$ (respectively of $a \triangleleft_s c$) implies

Proposition 3.6 *If two spheres touch another, then their centers are aligned with the touching point (= focus of the meet of the spheres).*

4 The ray given by two points

The notion of ray to be given now is closely related to what [2] calls a geodesic, except that a geodesic in M is (represented by) a map $R \to M$, whereas a ray is a map $R_{>0} \to M$, so is only a "half geodesic"; and, furthermore, a ray has, unlike a geodesic, a definite source or starting point.

Proposition 4.1 *Let a and b in M, with $ab = r$, say. Then for any $s, t \in R_{>0}$, we have*

$$a \triangleright_t (a \triangleright_s b) = a \triangleright_{s+t} b.$$

Proof. Let for brevity $c := a \triangleright_s b$ and $d := a \triangleright_t c$. Then $[abc]$ and $[acd]$, and hence also $[bcd]$, by Proposition 3.4. So $bd = bc + cd$, hence

$$ab + bd = ab + bc + cd = r + s + t.$$

Also, we have $[abd]$ by Proposition 3.4, so $ad = ab + bd = r + (s + t)$, so we get that d qualifies as $a \triangleright_{s+t} b$.

We call the map $R_{>0} \to M$ given by $s \mapsto a \triangleright_s b$ the *ray generated by a and b*, and we call b its *source* of the ray. (Note that we cannot say $a \triangleright_0 b = b$, since $a \triangleright_s b$ only is defined for $s > 0$.)

Proposition 4.2 *Any ray $R_{>0} \to M$ is an isometry i.e. is distance preserving. Furthermore, any triple of mutually apart points on a ray are aligned.*

Proof. The first assertion is an immediate consequence of Proposition 4.1; the second follows from the collinearity of a, b, and $a \triangleright_s b$ by iterated use of use of Proposition 3.4.

Thus, a ray with source b can be viewed as a "parametrization of its image by arc length, measured from b" (except that we have not attempted to define these terms here). Note that b itself is not in the image of the ray.

The following Example refers to the model of the axiomatics which one obtains from SDG, as in Subsection 1.4. It shows that the isometry property is not sufficient for being a ray:

Example. Consider in R^2 the points $a = (-1, 0), b = (0, 0)$, and consider the ray $s \mapsto a \triangleright_s b$; it is, of course, the positive x-axis, i.e. the map $s \mapsto (s, 0)$. But for any ϵ with $\epsilon^2 = 0$, the map given by $s \mapsto (s, \epsilon \cdot s^2)$ has the isometry property expressed by (xyz) for any three values corresponding to $s_1 < s_2 < s_3$; but the map is not a ray, since we cannot conclude $[xyz]$ unless $\epsilon = 0$.

5 Huygens' Theorem

Let T be a manifold, and let S_b, for $b \in T$, be a family of submanifolds of a manifold M.

An envelope E (note the indefinite article "an") for the family S_t ($t \in T$) is: it is *a* manifold such that every S_t touches E, and every point in E is touched by a unique S_t. The touching of E with S_t may take place in a *set* of points; this set of points is called the *characteristic set* at parameter value t.

(Here, we used the impredicative, or implicit, definition of the notion of envelope. (See [7] for a comparison with more explicit definition, equivalent to the "discriminant" method, which provides *the* (maximal) envelope.)

Theorem 5.1 *[Huygens] An envelope E of the $S(b, s)$, as b ranges over $S(a, r)$, is $S(a, r + s)$. For $b \in S(a, r)$, E touches $S(b, s)$ in $a \triangleright_s b$.*

Proof. For $b \in S(a, r)$, $S(b, s)$ touches $S(a, r+s)$ in $a \triangleright_s b$, by Axiom 2.1. Conversely, let $c \in S(a, r + s)$; we prove that c is touched by $S(b, s)$, if

we take $b := a \lhd_s c$. The point b is then in $S(a,r)$, by construction. So $S(b,s)$ touches $S(a,r+s)$ in $a \rhd_s b$, but since $b = a \lhd_s c$, this is $a \rhd_s (a \lhd_s c)$, which is c, by Proposition 3.3.

The uniqueness of b follows from the fact that radial projection is a bijection $S(a,r) \to S(a,r+s)$, cf. the Remark after Proposition 3.3.

6 Contact elements

The notion of contact element is trivial if $\sim$ is discrete, for then contact elements are just one-point sets, and a one point set does not generate a "ray orthogonal to it", as they do in SDG, see Subsection 6.2 below.

Definition 6.1 *A* contact element at $b \in M$ *is a subset* P *of* M *of the form* $\mathfrak{M}(a) \cap A$*, for* A *a sphere and* $a \in A$*.*

Let A, a and P be as in the definition. We then say that A *touches* P *at* a. If B is a sphere touching A at a, we have

$$A \cap B = \mathfrak{M}(a) \cap B = \mathfrak{M}(a) \cap A = P.$$

Assuming that for any sphere A and any $a \in A$, there exists a sphere B touching A at a, we therefore may equivalently describe a contact element at a as a set of the form $A \cap B$, for A and B spheres touching each other at a.

In subsection 6.2, we will refine the notion into that of a *transversally oriented* contact element.

In the intended applications, the contact elements in M make up the total space of the projectivized cotangent bundle of M.

6.1 Orthogonality

Given a contact element P at $b \in M$, and given $c \# b$. We say that c *is orthogonal to* P, witten $c \perp P$, if for all $b' \in P$, $b'c = bc$. (Thus, if $\sim$ is trivial, then all points $c \# b$ are orthogonal to P.) We clearly have $c \perp P$ iff $P \subseteq S(c,s)$ (where s denotes bc).

Proposition 6.2 *Assume that $[abc]$ holds. Let P be a contact element at a. Then $b \perp P$ implies $c \perp P$ (and vice versa)*

Proof. Assume $b \perp P$. Let r denote ab and s denote bc, so $ac = r + s$. For any $a' \sim a$, $a'b = r$ implies $a'c = r + s$, by the $[abc]$-assumption. Also $P \subseteq \mathfrak{M}(a)$. Since $a'b = r$ for all $a' \in P$, we therefore have $a'c = r + s$ for all $a' \in P$, which is the condition $c \perp P$. The other implication is similar.

Similarly, if P is a contact element at b, we have that $a \perp P$ iff $c \perp P$. Finally, if P is a contact element at c, we have that $a \perp P$ iff $b \perp P$.

Remark. Recall that if $ab = r$, then $c = a \triangleright_s b$ is characterized by $bc = s$ and $[abc]$. This gives rise to another characterization of $c = a \triangleright_s b$ in terms of $\perp$: let P be the contact element $\mathfrak{M}(b) \cap S(a, r)$ $(= S(c, s) \cap S(a, r))$. Then: *if $c \perp P$ and $bc = s$, then $c = a \triangleright_s b$.* This follows from (7) with $s = bc$. Note that $S(a, r)$ and $S(c, s)$ touch each other from the outside.

6.2 The ray generated by a contact element

Given a contact element P. The set of spheres touching P falls in two classes: two such spheres are in the same class if they touch another internally. To provide a contact element P with a *transversal orientation* means to select one of these two classes of spheres; the selected spheres we describe as those that touches P on the *negative* side, (we also say: on the *inside*).

Just as a contact element at c may be presented as the meet of any two spheres which touch each other at c, a transversally oriented contact element at c may be presented as the meet of any two spheres touching another, from the inside, at c.

Let P be a contact element at c, and let $x \perp P$, with $x \perp P$ and $cx = s$. Then the sphere $S(x, s)$ touches P. If P is equipped with a transversal orientation, then we say that x *is on the positive side* of P if the sphere $S(x, s)$ touches P from the outside.

Given a transversally oriented contact element P with focus b, and given an $s > 0$. We shall describe a point $P \vdash s$ by the following

procedure: pick a sphere $A = S(a, r)$ touching P from the inside (at b, so $r = ab$), so $[abc]$ with $c = a \triangleright_s b$. It follows from the Remark at the end of Subection 6.1 that this only depends on the s and the transversally oriented contact element P, but not on any particular choice of the sphere A touching P from the inside; we put $P \vdash s := a \triangleright_s b$. The notation suggests graphically the fact that this point is orthogonal to P, at distance s.

6.3 Inflation

Given a sphere $S(a, q)$, and given $t > 0$. The *t-inflation* of this sphere is by definition the sphere $S(a, q + t)$.

Proposition 6.3 *If two spheres touch each other internally, then the two t-inflated spheres likewise touch each other internally.*

Proof. Let the two spheres be $S(a, r+s)$ and $S(b, s)$, where $ab = r$. The point c where they touch therefore satisfies $[abc]$. Now inflate the two spheres by t, i.e. consider $S(a, r + s + t)$ and $S(b, s + t)$. Consider $d := b \triangleright_t c$. Then $[bcd]$, and $cd = t$. Since $[abc]$ and $[bcd]$, Proposition 3.4 gives that $[abd]$. This implies that for $d' \sim d$, $ad' = r+s+t$ iff $bd' = s+t$, which is the touching condition $\mathfrak{M}(d) \cap S(a, r+s+t) = \mathfrak{M}(d) \cap S(b, s+t)$.

The proof gives a little more precise information: the two inflated spheres touch each other at the point corresponding to the assumed touching point c under the "radial projection" $- \triangleright_t c$, i.e. they touch each other in $a \triangleright_t c$ $(= b \triangleright_t c)$.

There is a similar result for external touching, but then one of the centers has to be moved further away.

6.4 Flow of contact elements

Given a transversally oriented contact element P at b, as in Subsection 6.2. The construction of the ray $s \mapsto P \vdash s$ given there can be enhanced to a parametrized family of transversally oriented contact elements $s \mapsto P \Vdash s$, with $P \vdash s$ as focus of $P \Vdash s$. Pick, as in Subsection 6.2 a sphere $A = S(a, r)$ touching P from the inside at b. The inflated sphere $S(A, r + s)$ contains $a \triangleright_s b = P \vdash s$, so we get a

contact element $\mathfrak{M}(P \vdash s) \cap S(a, r+s)$, and we take this as $P \Vdash s$. We have to see that this is independent of the choice of A. We know already that the focus $P \vdash s$ is idependent of the choice. If we had chosen another A' to represent P, the spheres A' and A touch each other from the inside at b, hence their s-inflated versions likewise touch each other from the inside, at $P \vdash s$, by Proposition 6.3. This means that they define the same contact element at this point.

Another description of this contact element $P \Vdash s$, again only seemingly dependent on the choice of the sphere $A = S(a, r)$, is

$$P \Vdash s := \mathfrak{M}(a \triangleright_s b) \cap S(a, r+s).$$

7 Huygens' Theorem for hypersurfaces

Definition 7.1 *A* hypersurface *in M is a subset $B \subseteq M$ which satisfies: for every $b \in M$, $\mathfrak{M}(b) \cap B$ is a contact element.*

To give such B a transversal orientation *is to give every such contact element a transversal orientation.*

For suitable $s > 0$, we aim at describing "the *parallel surface* to B at distance s (in the positive direction)".

Consider a transversally oriented hypersurface B. For each $b \in B$, we have a transversally oriented contact element $B(b) := \mathfrak{M}(b) \cap B$, and therefore we have the ray which it generates.

If a point $x \in M$ has $x \perp B(b)$, one says that b is a *foot* of x on B. A given x may have several feet on B; thus if for instance x is the center of a sphere B, then every point $b \in B$ is a foot of x.

Now consider, for a given $b \in B$, the ray generated by the transversally oriented contact element $B(b)$. Every point x on this ray has b as a foot on B. We assume that for sufficiently small s, b is the unique foot of $B(b) \vdash s$ on B. For given such s, we denote the set of points obtained as $B(b) \vdash s$ for some $b \in B$, by $B \vdash s$. Thus we have a bijection $B \to (B \vdash s)$. Denote $B \vdash s$ by C, so by assumption, there is a bijection between B and C, with $b \in B$ and $c \in C$ corresponding under the bijection if b is the foot of c (equivalently, if $c = B(b) \vdash s$).

We have to make the following assumption, which in the intended application is a weak one: if a point c has a unique foot on B, then so does any $x \sim c$.

Proposition 7.2 *Under this assumption: if $b \in B$ and $c \in C$ correspond, then $\mathfrak{M}(c) \cap S(b,s) = \mathfrak{M}(c) \cap C$. In particular, C is a hypersurface.*

Proof. Let $x \sim c$. We have to prove that $bx = s$ iff $x \in C$. Assume $bx = s$. Let b' be the foot of x on B. Since $x \sim c$, $b' \sim b$. Since $bx = s$, and $x \perp B(b')$, we therefore have $b'x = s$. But $x \perp B(b')$ and $b'x = s$ characterizes the point on C corresponding to b'; so $x \in C$.

Conversely, let $x = c'$ with $c' \in C$ and $c' \sim c$. Then c' corresponds to a point $b' \in B$ with $b' \sim b$, implying that $c' = B(b') \vdash s$, hence $b'c' = s$; since $c' \perp B(b')$ and $b \in B(b')$, we have $bc' = s$.

Since $\mathfrak{M}(c) \cap S(b,s)$ is a contact element for every $c \in C$, it now follows that C is a hypersurface.

Recall that the C of this Proposition was more completely denoted $B \vdash s$, and it deserves the name of "hypersurface parallel to B at distance s".

We have therefore a generalization of Huygens' Theorem, stated in [1] p. 250. The surfaces $B \vdash s$ mentioned are the "wave fronts", or, the "dilatations" of B ([12] p. 14-15). The Huygens Theorem stated in Section 5 is the special case where $B = S(a,r)$.

Theorem 7.3 *Given a transversally oriented hypersurface B in M. Then for small enough s, we have another hypersurface $B \vdash s$, which is an envelope of the spheres $S(b,s)$ as b ranges over B. We have $B \vdash (s+t) = (B \vdash s) \vdash t$, for t and s small enough.*

The last assertion follows from Proposition 4.1.

Remark. Let us note that if $b \sim b' \in B$, then the two contact elements $P := \mathfrak{M}(b) \cap B$ and $P' = \mathfrak{M}(b') \cap B$ are in united position: we say that two contact elements P and P' are in *united position* if $b \in P'$ and $b' \in P$; this notion plays a central role in the work of S. Lie, [12].

8 Stiffness

A major aim in Busemann's work, and also in the present note, is to construct a notion of *line* in terms of distance. Basic here is the

notion of when three a, b, c points are *collinear*; classically, this is the statement (abc), i.e. $ab+bc = ac$; this is, in practical terms, to define lines in terms of taut strings[2]. This gives you something which is only rigid "longitudinally", but not "transversally", whereas our stronger notion, defined using $[abc]$, further involves transversal rigidity: if $[abc]$ holds, then the infinitesimal transversal variation given by replacing b by b', as in the basic picture (Subsection 1.1), still satisfies $(ab'c)$, but $[ab'c]$ fails.

In practical terms, (abc) refers to lines given by a taut string, whereas $[abc]$ refers to lines given by a *ruler* (or *straightedge*). The transversal rigidity, usually called its *stiffness*, of a ruler, is achieved by the *width* of the ruler; the stiffness makes the ruler better adapted than strings for *drawing* lines, when producing technical drawings on paper.

The stiffness of $[abc]$ is obtained by a a qualitative (infinitesimal) kind of width, given by the neighbour relation.

References

[1] V.I. Arnold, *Mathematical Methods of Classical Mechanics*, Graduate Texts in Math. 60, Springer 1978.

[2] H. Busemann, On Spaces in Which Two Points Determine a Geodesic, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 54 (1943), 171-184.

[3] H. Busemann, Synthetische Differentialgeometrie, Jahresbericht DMV 71 (1969), 1-24.

[4] H. Busemann, *Recent Synthetic Differential Geometry*, Ergebnisse der Mathematik 54, Springer 1970.

[5] J. Hjelmslev, Die natürliche Geometrie, Abhandlungen aus dem Math. Sem. der Uni. Hamburg (2), (1923), 1-36.

[6] A. Kock, *Synthetic Differential Geometry*, London Math. Soc. Lecture Notes 51, Cambridge U.P. 1981; 2nd Edition, London Math. Soc. Lecture Notes 333, Cambridge U.P. 2006.

[2] the word "line" in geometry is derived from "line" (thread made of linen) in textiles.

[7] A. Kock, Envelopes – Notion and Definiteness, Beiträge zur Alg. und Geom. 48 (2007), 345-350.

[8] A. Kock, *Synthetic Geometry of Manifolds*, Cambridge Tracts in Math. 180, Cambridge U.P 2010.

[9] A. Kock, New Methods for Old Spaces: Synthetic Differential Geometry, arXiv 1610.00286. To appear in *New Spaces in Mathematics and Physics*, ed. M. Anel and G. Catren.

[10] R. Lavendhomme, *Basic Concepts of Synthetic Differential Geometry*, Kluwer 1996.

[11] S. Lie, Zur Theorie partieller Differentialgleichungen, Götting. Nachrichten 1872, p. 480.

[12] S. Lie, *Geometrie der Berührungstransformationen*, p. 39, Leipzig 1896 (reprint Chelsea Publ. Co., New York 1977.

[13] I. Moerdijk and G.E. Reyes, *Models for Smooth Infinitesimal Analysis*, Springer 1991.

kock (at) math.au.dk
Dept. of Mathematics, University of Aarhus,
December 2016